Arbitration at The Hague, the development of a Council of Conciliation, and periodic congresses of the nations. All were ready to recommend the establishment and development of a permanent committee of The Hague Conference with administrative powers. Other subjects favorably considered were: The enactment of a Federal statute extending the jurisdiction of our Federal courts over all cases involving the rights of resident aliens; the adoption of an immigration law for the United States, so framed as to apply impartially to all races; the Pan American Union as a possible American League of Peace with Justice, and the Central American Bureau and Court. Military training in the public schools was condemned. It was thought necessary to urge that every legitimate effort be made to secure the adoption of agreements looking towards a greater international freedom of commerce. The so-called Hensley clauses in the Naval Appropriations Act of 1916 were unanimously approved.

As a result of this conference, we ought soon to know whether there is any appreciable body of opinion in this country favorable to a wider extension of the principles of democracy. We ought soon to know, as another result of this conference, whether the peace workers do or do not favor the program of the League to Enforce Peace. Too, we shall learn the views of the pacifists on such questions as the reduction of armaments, national equality, religious liberty, the free use of native languages, the control of foreign policy, and secret treaties. The question whether we should or should not work for a Conference of Neutral Nations ought soon to be answered. Our attitude towards an economic war to follow the present war will soon be defined. Whether the United States Government shall act upon the principle that investments by its citizens abroad shall be protected by such legal safeguards as are provided in the country where the investments are made, or whether they shall be placed under the military and naval forces of the United States, is now under consideration. The attitude of the conferees towards conscription will soon be known.

The fact that they elected a continuation committee shows that the peace workers believe in a further cooperation and in that more intelligent effort which should follow from intelligent organization. A distinct step towards a hopeful and united American pacifism was taken at this quiet conference. We anticipate with satisfaction the next steps, each one of which we expect will mark a significant advance. Now, while the world's nerves are exposed, when all are alive to the evils of might, at the time when souls are on fire and the opposition to war is acute, is the time to focus the forces of peace upon the future of our world. The peace workers of America are awakening to their joint responsibility.

A NECESSARY PEACE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

MR. OSCAR T. CROSBY is quite correct in his contention that before the United States can transfer to an international organization the power of determining international disputes threatening war, especially if compelling power be given to such an outside organization, it will require an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is quite true that our military forces cannot be set into action in cooperation with the forces of other nations, particularly if those forces are to be directed against this country, without a modification of our Constitution.

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Crosby, Senator Shafroth introduced the following joint resolution, known as Senate Joint Resolution 131, which resolution was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

JOINT RESOLUTION proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the creation, with other nations, of an international peace-enforcing tribunal or tribunals for the determination of all international disputes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed to the several States of the Union, with recommendation that they adopt the same by vote of their respective legislatures:

"The President is authorized to negotiate, and, after ratification by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, to sign a treaty or treaties with all or a part of the other sovereign nations of the world, engaging the United States to submit for final determination all its international disputes threatening war to an international tribunal or tribunals, and also engaging the United States to assist in supplying funds for the support of said tribunal or tribunals, and *of any international civil and military establishment,* to be controlled by an international authority, that may be required by the treaty or treaties as a sanction for the execution of the decrees and the fulfillment of the demands of the said international organisms when such decrees or demands are made in conformity with the agreements instituting said organisms, and engaging the United States to recognize the authority of said international organisms (or one or more of them) to make final interpretation of the powers conferred upon them."

While we agree with Mr. Crosby in his contention that some such change in the Constitution, as herein provided, will be necessary, we regret that in place of the words "of any international civil and military establishment," italicized in the quotation, there could not have been substituted some such words as "any organs founds necessary for the effective establishment of such tribunal or tribunals." The author of this resolution, like all others who believe in an international force,

does not seem to realize that by placing his emphasis upon force he is making it vastly more difficult to get any case before an international tribunal.

SCUTTLING AN INTERNATIONAL COURT

THE only International Court in the world has recently handed down a decision in which the United States and the cause of international peace are intimately concerned. This country prides itself on being foremost in the promotion of peace between the nations of the earth through some form of international combination based upon law, order, and justice. It is natural to suppose that this country, thus minded, would be the first to heed the decision of an international court. As a matter of fact, the contrary seems to be the case. Our State Department, on being informed of the decision of the Central American Court of Justice, declaring that Nicaragua has, through its recent treaty with this country, violated the treaty rights of Costa Rica, has thus far taken no official cognizance of this decision, on the ground, it is reported, that our country is not a party to the court. Yet, though not technically a party to the court, we are most certainly a party to the treaty which the court has declared to be unjust. Moreover, it is we who made this court possible, and who agreed to stand for it. The question, then, is: Will or will not this country recognize its moral responsibility in this case, and, that our responsibility and the validity of the treaty we made with Nicaragua may be definitely ascertained, voluntarily place itself within the jurisdiction of the Central American court?

By the terms of the Bryan-Chamorro treaty of August, 1914, ratified by our Senate, we are given a grant of canal rights through Nicaragua, and a lease of Great and Little Corn Islands, and territory for establishment of a naval base on the Gulf of Fonseca. In consideration for these rights, it is provided that we shall pay $3,000,000 to Nicaragua, with the interesting proviso that this money shall be expended only as we shall approve. To the terms of that treaty the countries of Central America, exclusive of Nicaragua, have made specific objections, and upon the objections of Costa Rica in particular was based the case decided September 30, 1916, by the Central American Court of Justice.

In this action Costa Rica appeared before the court, calling attention, among other things, to the award of President Cleveland, rendered on May 22, 1888, when he acted as arbitrator in the boundary dispute between Costa Rica and Nicaragua involving the validity and interpretation of the Cañas-Jerez treaty of 1858. Mr. Cleveland's award at that time held that Nicaragua "remains bound not to make any grants for canal purposes across her territory without first asking the opinion of the republic of Costa Rica." This "opinion," according to the old treaty, would be " only advisory," unless Costa Rica's natural rights should be injured; but, said Mr. Cleveland, "in cases where the construction of the canal will involve an injury to the natural rights of Costa Rica, . . . it would seem . . . that her consent is necessary."

Costa Rica now claims that any such canal as that stipulated in the Bryan-Chamorro treaty is impossible without damage to her, and further claims that neither was her consent asked nor was she in any way consulted; that she was not even advised of the preparation of the treaty.

In her complaint before the court, Costa Rica declares that our action in this matter has been unjust and illegal, since we have accepted from another country something of which, under the circumstances, that country had no right to dispose. "No one," says the complaint, "can transfer more rights than he has nor those that he does not possess." Nicaragua's right to dispose of territory for an interoceanic canal, in other words, was limited by its obligation first to consult Costa Rica. Since this was not done, Nicaragua's position is therefore much the same as that of a person who surreptitiously disposes of property upon which there is a lien held by a third person.

Under the common law such a transaction would be termed illegal and void. The Central American Court of Justice has declared Nicaragua's transaction illegal, but it cannot call it void, since this country, a party to the transaction, is not under its jurisdiction. We therefore stand in the light of a person who enjoys a right illegally incurred, but who cannot be brought to book for it. Again we ask, Shall not our moral responsibility in this matter urge us to clear ourselves, if we may, by voluntarily placing ourselves within the jurisdiction of that court?

This we can do, if we will. Our moral responsibility so to do is threefold: First, that, according to our expressed purpose in 1907, we may preserve peace and justice in Central America; second, that we may maintain our recognized integrity as mediator between Central American States; and, third, that we may uphold the integrity of the Central American Court of Justice, which we helped to found. Our effort to excuse ourselves from this responsibility on the grounds of technicality does not hold, for if the sentiments that President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Root expressed in 1907 were anything more than airy compliments, meant only to deceive the five republics concerned, they were specific assurances that this country stood in the relation of elder-brother-republic to the five, willing to act as sponsor for the peaceful arrangement made at that time, and united with them in the sincere purpose